

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/722,589	Applicant(s) COHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark W. Bockelman	Art Unit 3766	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark W. Bockelman.

(3) Sanford Colb.

(2) Carl Layno.

(4) Shai Ayal.

Date of Interview: 05 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 35, 111, 121 and 125.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner mistakenly included claim 35 in the 112 first paragraph rejection of the office action mailed 1-5-2007 since the term antidromic does not appear in the claim. The examiner will review the art of record and update the search with respect to claim 35 in the next office action. Claims 111, 121, and 125 will be amended in a similar fashion as claim 35 since applicant has support for stimulating nervous tissue in one direction (orthdromic) and blocking pulses in a second, opposite direction. The examiner will review the art of record and update the search. for these claims as well.